

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-77 are pending in the application. Claims 1-27, 29-41, 43-47 and 49-75, and 77 stand rejected by the Examiner. Claims 28, 42, 48, and 76 are objected to. Claims 78-104 have been added herein.

### ***Examiner's Interview***

Patentee's representative would like to thank Examiner Goddard for the courtesies extended to patentee's representative, John V. Biernacki, during the telephone interview on February 1, 2005. During the interview, the cited references Simoudis (USPN 5,692,107) and Myers (USPN 5,832,450) were discussed in view of what data models (if any) are disclosed in these cited references. More specifically, the Myers reference was discussed relative to claim 1's recitation of handling predictive data models. The remarks and amendments contained herein further summarize the interview.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant sincerely thanks the examiner for indicating that claims 28, 42, and 48 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and that claim 76 would be allowable if an informality was corrected.

Claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of claim 28 and any intervening dependent claims. Claim 31 was amended to include the limitations of claim 42 and any intervening dependent claims. Claim 46 was amended to include the limitations of claim 48 and any intervening dependent claims. Claim 76 was amended not to overcome a

rejection, but rather to correct an informality -- namely, to add the word "and" prior to the last element of claim 76.

Because claims 1, 31, and 46 have been amended to include subject matter indicated as allowable, and because the informality of claim 76 has been corrected, applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable and should proceed to issuance. Claim 77 which depends from claim 76 should also be allowable because claim 77 has been amended to address its rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 3, 10, 11, and 29 were only amended to correct the dependency of these claims.

Applicant maintains that the previously submitted arguments overcome the rejections of the office action, but to expedite prosecution of this case, applicant has cancelled the non-allowed claims. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute in subsequent cases the cancelled claims.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2 / 23 / 2005

By: John V. Biernacki  
John V. Biernacki  
Reg. No. 40,511  
JONES DAY  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114